UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,475	11/26/2001	Gene Ciancaglini	67272-8072.US01	7235

77042 7590 10/15/2008

Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1208
Seattle, WA 98111-1208

EXAMINER	
KIM, DAVID S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/994,475	CIANCAGLINI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID S. KIM	2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 October 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *8-15,17-30,35,37 and 38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *8-15,17-30,35,37 and 38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Applicant's response to the objection to **claims 33 and 36** in the previous Office Action (mailed on 03 September 2008) is noted and appreciated. Applicant responded by cancelling these claims. Applicant's response overcomes the previous objection, which is presently withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. The indicated allowability of **claims 8-15, 17-30, 35, and 37-38** is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,152). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 8-15, 17-27, 37, and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modiano et al. ("Design and analysis of an asynchronous WDM local area network using a master/slave scheduler", hereinafter "Modiano") in view of Fukui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,490, hereinafter "Fukui") and Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,152, hereinafter "Anderson").

(claim 8) Modiano discloses a medium access protocol (MAC) for a WDM LAN (abstract), a scheduler (abstract), a control channel (channel on wavelength c in Figs. 1-2), a data channel (any suitable channel in Fig. 1), and nodes coupled to the control channel and the data channel (hub and terminals in Fig. 1).

Modiano's MAC also comprises a control message transmitting step (p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph, l. 3-4, the scheduler schedules transmission requests and informs OTs with transmission instructions). This control message specifies one of the nodes as a source node (when a node receives a transmission assignment, this reception indicates that it is a source node for a transmission, p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph). This control message also specifies another one of the nodes as a destination node (e.g., the assignment for queue 1 in Fig. 5 is a transmission assignment for node 1 to transmit to node 3).

After this transmitting step, the MAC comprises a step of waiting (e.g., in the case of unassigned node 3 in queue 3 in Fig. 5, node 3 waits for the next potential assignment; e.g., it is implied that the hub waits at least one slot before sending another transmission assignment to a particular node, p. 901-902, bridging paragraph, otherwise, the node would switch transmission assignments before completing its first assignment) a predetermined period of time related to the value specified in the first control message (e.g., if node 3 is unassigned for one slot, node 3 would wait the duration of that slot for the next potential assignment, p. 904, col. 1; e.g., the hub would wait at least one slot).

Modiano does not expressly disclose that this control message specifies ***a value which corresponds to an amount of information that the source node can transmit***. However, including such a value is a known practice, as exemplified by Fukui ("number of transfer bytes" in Fig. 9). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such a value in the control message of Modiano. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this for the intuitively practical consideration of the length of a transmission. That is, Modiano does imply the ending of a transmission ("slot size" limits on p. 903, col. 2, last paragraph) but is relatively silent about the length of such a transmission. Fukui's teaching is suitable to speak into this silence by providing an applicable practice to address the intuitively practical consideration of the length of a transmission. That is, the method of Modiano involves each node transmitting within the limitations of a slot. If a transmitting node does not know when to end transmitting, this node's transmissions may overlap, or "collide", in the next slot with the scheduled transmissions of another node.

Modiano does not expressly disclose that the control message is a packet. However, a packet is one of the most common transmission structures for network communications. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to embody the control message in a packet. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since the nodes already receive communication through packets (p. 904, col. 2, last paragraph). That is, this implies that the nodes already possess infrastructure for receiving communication through packets.

Modiano does not expressly disclose:

the first control packet specifying a preview of a second control packet.

However, the general concept of such a practice is known in the art, as exemplified by Anderson (the control information of the "descriptor block" containing the preview of "a link to a descriptor block for the packet that is to follow it" in col. 4, l. 9-12). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the concept of this practice with the teachings of Modiano. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since it enables the feature of preparing two packets of data for transmission ahead of time (Anderson, col. 3, l. 17-18), which increases the likelihood of successful transmission (Anderson, col. 3, l. 16-17).

(claim 9) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 8 further comprising:

receiving the first control packet at each of the plurality of nodes in the network (the star in Fig. 1 distributes the control wavelength to all the nodes); and

in response to the source node receiving the first control packet, transmitting (p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph) from the source node onto the data channel an amount of information not greater than the amount specified in the first control packet (nodes are assigned to transmit an amount corresponding to a slot, e.g., p. 904, col. 2, last paragraph).

(claim 10) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 8 wherein in response to the destination node specified in the control packet receiving the first control packet, the destination node monitors (Fig. 2, tunable receivers in destination nodes have to tune to the appropriate wavelength to properly receive from the data channel) the data channel for data following the first control packet (control information to transmit during a particular transmission slot is received before the start of the transmission slot, p. 903, col. 1, last paragraph, so reception occurs following the control information).

(claim 11) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 10 wherein the destination node specified in the first control packet retrieves the data from the data channel of the network (any suitable channel in Fig. 1).

(claim 12) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 8 wherein the amount of information specified in the first control packet corresponds to a predetermined number of data packets (p. 904, col. 2, last paragraph).

(claim 13) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 9 wherein transmitting the amount of information includes transmitting one or more data packets immediately or after a delay known to both the scheduler and the node (e.g., p. 901-902, bridging paragraph).

(claim 14) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 8 wherein in response to the node to which the control packet is addressed receiving the first control packet, immediately or after a delay known to both the scheduler and the node transmitting no more bytes than are permitted by the first control packet (transmission is limited to a slot, p. 903, col. 1, last paragraph, p. 904, col. 2, last paragraph).

(claim 15) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson does not expressly disclose:

The protocol of Claim 9 wherein receiving the first control packet at each of the plurality of nodes in the network includes passively tapping the control channel at each of the plurality of nodes in the network to receive the first control packet.

However, note the receiver coupling/tapping shown in the nodes in Fig. 2. Such coupling/tapping is conventionally passive.

(claim 17) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 14 further comprising dispatching a second control packet after waiting for the predetermined period of time (e.g., in the case of unassigned node 3 in queue 3 in Fig. 5, note that another assignment message will follow for the next slot, p. 904, col. 1).

(claim 18) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 17 wherein at least one of a source node (e.g., queue 3 corresponds to node 3 in Fig. 5) and a destination node specified in the second control packet is different than the source node (e.g., queue 2 corresponds to node 2 in Fig. 5) and the destination node (e.g., assignment of destination node 1 for queue 2 in Fig. 2) specified in the first control packet.

(claim 19) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 8 wherein the control channel and the data channel are carried by the same fiber (any suitable fiber link in Fig. 1) and wherein the control packet on the control channel is "out-of-band" (separate control wavelength c in Figs. 1-2) from data on the data channel.

(claim 20) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 8 wherein transmitting the first control packet includes transmitting the first control packet from a headend (hub in Fig. 1) of the network.

(claim 21) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 20 wherein transmitting the first control packet from a headend of the network includes the headend dispatching a scheduler allocation message (SAM) (e.g., messages from scheduler in Fig. 1).

(claim 22) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The protocol of Claim 21 wherein the SAM specifies a source node address (e.g., designation for transmitting node/queue in Fig. 5), a destination node address (e.g., designation for receiving node in Fig. 5), and at least one of: (a) a number of bytes (simply divide the slot size by the size of a byte) the source node may transmit to the destination node; and (b) an amount of time in which the source node may transmit (one slot at a time, e.g., p. 904, col. 2, last paragraph).

(claim 23) Claim 23 is an apparatus claim that corresponds largely to the method claim 8. Therefore, the recited limitations in method claim 8 read on the corresponding limitations in apparatus claim 23. Claim 23 also includes limitations absent from claim 8. Modiano discloses some of these limitations:

an interface to couple to a plurality of nodes in the network via an unidirectional optical path in the network (fiber links in Fig. 1 are unidirectional), said unidirectional optical path having a control channel (separate control wavelength c in Figs. 1-2) and a data channel (any suitable data channel in Fig. 1);

the time period corresponding to a data transmission time for a node (one slot amount of time, p. 903, col. 1, last paragraph); and

waiting a period of time corresponding to the allotted data transmission time for node prior to releasing another control message (e.g., it is implied that the hub waits at least one slot amount of time before sending another transmission assignment to a particular node, p. 901-902, bridging paragraph, otherwise, the node would switch transmission assignments before completing its first assignment).

Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson does not expressly disclose:

the control message ***processor*** and

the scheduler timing ***processor***, in communication with said control message processor, said scheduler timing processor for causing said control message processor to perform said waiting step above.

However, processors are extremely well known in the art for implementing networks, like the network of Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement a control message processor and a scheduler timing processor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since computing functions, like the control message function and the scheduler timing function, are conventionally implemented by processors. Accordingly, since the scheduler timing function of Modiano (e.g., p. 903-904, section C) in view of Fukui and Anderson controls the timing of control communication with the

nodes, the scheduler timing processor would be in communication with the control message processor and would control the timing of the control message processor, such as the waiting step above.

(claim 24) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson does not expressly disclose:

the scheduler authorization message (SAM) ***processor***.

However, similar to the treatment of claim 23 above, implement such a processor for the SAM function of Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson would be obvious.

(claim 25) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The network of Claim 23 wherein the control and data channels are separate from each other (separate control wavelength c in Figs. 1-2).

(claim 26) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The network of Claim 23 wherein the individual data channels and control channels are distinguished by wavelength (different wavelength for data and control channels in Fig. 1).

(claim 27) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The network of claim 25, wherein the control channel is out-of-band from the data channel (separate control wavelength c in Figs. 1-2).

(claim 37) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

A method comprising:

receiving a first control packet (p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph, l. 3-4, the scheduler schedules transmission requests and informs OTs with transmission instructions; see the treatment of "packet" in claim 8 above) over a control channel (channel on wavelength c in Figs. 1-2) of a wavelength division multiplexed (WDM) (abstract) network, the first control packet specifying a first one of a plurality of nodes in the WDM network as a source node (when a node receives a transmission assignment, this reception indicates that it is a source node for a transmission, p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph), a second one of the plurality of nodes in the WDM network as a destination node (e.g., the assignment for queue 1 in Fig. 5 is a transmission assignment for node 1 to transmit to node 3), a value which corresponds to an amount of information which the source node can transmit (see the treatment of the corresponding limitation in claim 8 above), and a preview of a second control packet (Anderson, the control information of the "descriptor

block" containing the preview of "a link to a descriptor block for the packet that is to follow it" in col. 4, l. 9-12);

in response to the first control packet, a third one (any suitable node of Fig. 1 that is not the "first node" or the "second node" of the claim) of the plurality of nodes retrieving a plurality of data packets (Anderson, preparation of packets in col. 3, l. 17-18) based on the preview of the second control packet (Anderson, the control information of the "descriptor block" containing the preview of "a link to a descriptor block for the packet that is to follow it" in col. 4, l. 9-12); receiving the second control packet over the control channel after at least a predetermined period of time related to the value specified the first control packet (e.g., it is implied that the hub waits at least one slot amount of time before sending another transmission assignment to a particular node, p. 901-902, bridging paragraph, otherwise, the node would switch transmission assignments before completing its first assignment); and

in response to the second control packet, the third one of the plurality of nodes transmitting the plurality of data packets over a data channel of the WDM network (Anderson, the "preview" of the "second control packet", col. 4, l. 9-12, would prompt the "third node" to transmit the packet(s) of the "preview").

(claim 38) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

The method of claim 37, wherein the first and the second control packets are from a scheduler in of the WDM network ("scheduler" in the abstract).

6. **Claims 29-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Gehlhaar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,916, hereinafter "Gehlhaar").

(claim 28) Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson discloses:

A method comprising:

in response to a request (requests on p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph) from one of a plurality of nodes in a local-area optical wavelength division multiplexed (WDM) network (Fig. 1), transmitting a second control packet (p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph, l. 3-4, the scheduler schedules transmission requests and informs OTs with transmission instructions) from a scheduler in the WDM network over a control channel (channel on wavelength c in Fig. 1) of the WDM network, the second control packet

including a preview of a third control packet (Anderson, the control information of the "descriptor block" containing the preview of "a link to a descriptor block for the packet that is to follow it" in col. 4, l. 9-12).

Modiano in view of Fukui and Anderson does not expressly disclose:

periodically polling a plurality of nodes in a local-area optical wavelength division multiplexed (WDM) network to obtain statistical information on the plurality of nodes, said polling comprising sending a first control packet to each of the plurality of nodes over a control channel, the first control packet specifying the scheduler as the destination node, wherein each of the plurality of nodes sends feedback to the scheduler over a data channel in response to the first control packet; and

the second control packet including a first value corresponding to an amount of information which the one of the plurality of nodes can transmit.

Regarding the control packet limitation, notice the treatment of the corresponding limitation in claim 8 above. The argument applied above is applied here to the corresponding control packet limitation.

Regarding the polling limitation, periodically polling a plurality of nodes to obtain statistical information is well known in the art, as shown by Gehlhaar (col. 2, l. 35-57, col. 3, l. 11-12). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such polling in the method of Modiano. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since such statistical information allows one to manage the resources of the network to ensure optimum performance (Gehlhaar, col. 2, l. 35-38).

Regarding the limitation of "sending a first control packet to each of the nodes over a control channel", one would implement the polling step above by sending a message (Gehlhaar, col. 3, l. 11-12) to each of the nodes. The nature of such a message is control information, so an obvious variation is to send a control packet. Moreover, it is obvious to send *control* packets over the *control* channel of Modiano.

Regarding the limitation of "the first control packet specifying the scheduler as the destination node", notice that the scheduler of Modiano serves as a network manager for the network. Gehlhaar

teaches that the feedback would go from the network elements to the destination of the network manager (Gehlhaar, col. 2, l. 45-49, col. 3, l. 11-12). Accordingly, it obvious for the first control packet to specify the scheduler as the destination node for communications from the network elements to the network manager.

Regarding the limitation of "wherein each of the plurality of nodes sends feedback to the scheduler over the data channel in response to the first control packet", notice that there are two types of channels in Modiano, the control channel and the data channel. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that either channel is suitable for carrying response communications (Gehlhaar, e.g., col. 3, l. 11-12) from the nodes to the scheduler. Thus, it is an obvious variation for each of the plurality of nodes sends feedback to the scheduler over the data channel in response to the first control packet.

(claim 29) Modiano in view of Fukui, Anderson, and Gehlhaar discloses:

The method of claim 28, further comprising:

wherein the control channel (separate control wavelength c in Figs. 1-2) and the data channel (any suitable data channel in Fig. 1) are in an unidirectional optical path (fiber links in Fig. 1 are unidirectional) within the WDM network (different wavelength for data and control channels in Fig. 1).

(claim 30) Modiano in view of Fukui, Anderson, and Gehlhaar does not expressly disclose:

The method of claim 29, further comprising:

in response to a second request from a second one of the plurality of nodes, transmitting the third control packet from the scheduler over the control channel after waiting the predetermined period of time, the third control packet specifying a second value corresponding to a second amount of information which the second one of the plurality of nodes can transmit, ***wherein the second value differs from the first value***.

This limitation of the second value concerns the amount of information that a node can transmit. However, such a parameter is an obvious one to vary. Greater amounts lead to the benefit of easier transmission of larger files and data streams. Smaller amounts lead to more frequent transmission assignments, which result in more frequent servicing of pending transmission requests (Modiano, queues in Fig. 5). Moreover, Modiano discusses "an average slot size of 10,000 bits" (p. 903, col. 2, last

paragraph), which suggests varying slot sizes, or varying amounts of information that a node can transmit. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ this second value indicating a differing amount of information that a node(s) can transmit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since one would need to differentiate between differing amounts of information that is transmitted by the nodes of Modiano. One generally notes such differentiation through a differing value.

7. **Claim 35** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modiano in view of Fukui, Anderson, and Gehlhaar, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Weik (*Fiber Optics Standard Dictionary, 3rd ed.*).

(claim 35) Modiano in view of Fukui, Anderson, and Gehlhaar discloses:

The method of claim 8 further comprises:

in response to a second source node receiving the first control packet, the second source node preparing to send data according to the preview in the first control packet (the nodes of Modiano would prepare to send data (Anderson, col. 3, l. 17-18,) for two cycles of transmission (Anderson, col. 6, l. 20) according to the preview of "a link to a descriptor block for the packet that is to follow it" (Anderson, col. 4, l. 9-12)).

Modiano in view of Fukui, Anderson, and Gehlhaar does not expressly disclose:

wherein the preview in the control packet comprises a second source node of the second control packet.

However, notice that control packets of Modiano already specify one of the nodes as a source node (when a node receives a transmission assignment, this reception indicates that it is a source node for a transmission, p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph). Also, notice that the control packets of Modiano are broadcast to all of the nodes (channel on wavelength c in Figs. 1-2 reaches all the nodes). Somehow, each node must know how to distinguish scheduling information/control packets for itself from scheduling information/control packets for other nodes. Generally, this practice of distinguishing is provided through an address (Weik, "identifies a…destination", "indicates the destination" in "address" on p. 13). At the

time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include some kind of addressing label in the "preview" of the prior art of record. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this so that each node can distinguish scheduling information of the "preview" for itself from scheduling information of the "preview" for other nodes (Weik, "identifies a…destination", "indicates the destination" in "address" on p. 13), including scheduling information in the "preview" of the prior art of record. Since this addressing label in the "preview" of the prior art of record indicates a source node of Modiano (when a node receives a transmission assignment, this reception indicates that it is a source node for a transmission, p. 901, col. 2, last paragraph), this addressing label in the "preview" of the prior art of record constitutes "a second source node of the second control packet".

Remarks

8. In view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Anderson, there are new ground(s) of rejection. Also, the finality of the last Office action 03 September 2008 is withdrawn.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID S. KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-3033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9 AM to 5 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth N. Vanderpuye can be reached on 571-272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. S. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2613

/Kenneth N Vanderpuye/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2613